

Prediction of Pediatric No-Show Rates Before and During the COVID-19 Pandemic Utilizing Machine Learning

1 Quincy A. Hathaway, MD, PhD^{1,2}, Naveena Yanamala, PhD³, , TaraChandra Narumanchi, MD^{1,5},
2 *Janani Narumanchi, MD^{1,4}

3

4 ¹Aspirations LLC, Morgantown, WV, USA

5 ²Penn Medicine, University of Pennsylvania Health System, PA, USA

6 ³Rutgers Robert Wood Johnson Medical School, New Brunswick, NJ, USA

7 ⁴University of Tennessee, Le Bonheur Children's Hospital, Memphis, TN, USA

8 ⁵Chicagi LLC, Ste R 10 N Gould street, Sheridan, WY, USA

9

10 *Correspondence:

11 Associate Professor,
12 University of Tennessee Health Science Center,
13 Le Bonheur Children's Hospital
14 51 N. Dunlap St., 3rd Floor
15 Memphis, TN 38105 jnaruman@uthsc.edu

16

17 **Word Count:** Less than 12,000

18

19 **Keywords:** (Min.5-Max. 8)

20 **Abstract**

21 **Background:** Patient no-shows significantly disrupt pediatric healthcare delivery, highlighting the
22 necessity for precise predictive models, especially during the dynamic shifts caused by the SARS-
23 CoV-2 pandemic. In outpatient settings, these no-shows result in medical resource underutilization,
24 increased healthcare costs, reduced access to care, and lower clinic efficiency and productivity.

25 **Methods:** The objective is to develop a predictive model for patient no-shows using data-driven
26 techniques. We analyzed five years of historical data retrieved from both a scheduling system and
27 electronic health records from a general pediatrics clinic within the WVU Health systems. This
28 dataset comprises a total of 209,408 visits from 2015 to 2018, 82,925 visits in 2019, and 58,820 visits
29 in 2020, spanning both pre-pandemic and pandemic periods. The data includes variables such as
30 patient demographics, appointment details, timing, hospital characteristics, appointment types, and
31 environmental factors.

32 **Results:** Our XGBoost model demonstrated robust predictive capabilities, notably outperforming
33 traditional "no-show rate" metrics. Precision and recall metrics for all features were 0.82 and 0.88,
34 respectively. Receiver Operator Characteristic (ROC) analysis yielded AUCs of 0.90 for all features
35 and 0.88 for the top 5 predictors when evaluated on the 2019 cohort. Furthermore, model
36 generalization across racial/ethnic groups was also observed. Evaluation on 2020 telehealth data
37 reaffirmed model efficacy (AUC: 0.90), with consistent top predictive features.

38 **Conclusions:** Our study presents a sophisticated predictive model for pediatric no-show rates,
39 offering insights into nuanced factors influencing attendance behavior. The model's adaptability to
40 evolving healthcare landscapes, including telehealth, underscores its potential for enhancing clinical
41 practice and resource allocation.

42 **Introduction**

43 Patient no-shows, defined as a patient failing to attend a scheduled appointment without prior
44 notification, vary widely across healthcare settings, ranging from 12% to 80% (Marbough et al.,
45 2020). No-shows are a major logistical and economic challenge for clinics and hospital systems,
46 leading to significant revenue losses. No-shows cost the U.S. healthcare system more than \$150
47 billion a year and individual physicians an average of \$200 per unused time slot (Gier, 2017).
48 Whether patients show up or not, healthcare organizations and medical practices must still pay their
49 staff and cover expenses of resources/facilities. For the provider, no-showed appointments decrease
50 the volume of medical care that can be given. For patients, the increasing lengths of time needed to
51 schedule follow-up appointments can be prohibitive of receiving proper care (Ansell et al., 2017).
52 Patients who failed to keep an appointment were up to 70% more likely not to return within 18
53 months, with older patients experiencing more chronic illnesses and more likely not to return to their
54 physicians' offices after missing just one appointment (Hayhurst, 2019).

55 Several studies have modeled strategies for reducing patient wait times for clinic appointments
56 through artificial intelligence (AI)-enabled technologies and solutions (Salazar et al., 2022). These
57 machine and deep learning approaches have utilized random forest (Qureshi et al., 2021;Salazar et
58 al., 2021), logistic regression (Moharram et al., 2021;Qureshi et al., 2021), gradient boosting
59 (Daghistani et al., 2020;Fan et al., 2021), ensemble-based models (Ahmadi et al., 2019;Alshammari
60 et al., 2021), deep neural networks (Alshammari et al., 2020;Srinivas and Salah, 2021), and various
61 other approaches to predict patient no-shows. Studies have also examined the type of visit, whether
62 primary care or specialty clinic, and varying demographic populations (e.g., United States, Saudi
63 Arabia, Brazil, etc.) (Salazar et al., 2022). While outpatient scheduling with a healthcare provider is
64 traditionally thought to be the largest percentage of no-showed appointments, the use of no-show
65 algorithms could also predict patient readmissions (Shameer et al., 2017) and attrition from

66 diagnostic visits (i.e., imaging and laboratory studies) (Chong et al., 2020). These individualized
67 approaches boost patient/provider satisfaction (Mohammadi et al., 2018) and allow for a more
68 efficient model of healthcare.

69 The factors affecting patient no-shows can vary slightly between studied populations but can be
70 generalized into three major categories: 1) modifiable and unmodifiable patient characteristics (e.g.,
71 age, sex, race/ethnicity, BMI), 2) type of appointment scheduled (i.e. primary care or specialty
72 clinic), and 3) patient behavior (e.g., previous no-show rate, time-to-appointment, travel distance,
73 weather, etc.) (Salazar et al., 2022). Previous research indicates patients who miss appointments tend
74 to be of lower socioeconomic status, often have a history of failed/no-show appointments,
75 government-provided health benefits, and psychosocial problems who are less likely to understand
76 the purpose of the appointment (Ellis et al., 2017;Daghistani et al., 2020;Marbouh et al., 2020). In
77 addition to forgetting appointments, issues such as trouble getting off work, finding childcare,
78 transportation, and cost can also limit patient compliance for an appointment. No-show rates also
79 increase with increasing time between scheduling and the actual appointment (Festinger et al., 2002).
80 In pediatrics, few studies have examined how no-show rates can be predicted using machine learning
81 (Chen et al., 2020;Liu et al., 2022), with no pediatric studies exploring how the SARS-CoV-2
82 pandemic affects the ability of no-show rates to handle virtual appointments.

83 Our study, assess the ability of a machine learning model to predict no-show rates in a pediatric
84 population both before and during the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic. We utilized electronic medical record
85 (EMR) data for patients, including features related to modifiable and unmodifiable patient
86 characteristics, appointment type, and patient behavior. We build our model on pre-pandemic
87 outpatient appointment data and utilized pre-pandemic and pandemic derived external validation sets.
88 We were able to effectively predict pediatric no-show rates in our validation sets and further explored
89 the role of race/ethnicity in no-show rate prediction.

90 **Methods**

91 *Ethical Approval*

92 The study was approved by West Virginia University Institutional Review Board.

93

94 *Study Population & Data Preprocessing*

95 Data from medical appointments were gathered from an outpatient clinic within a prominent
96 academic pediatric hospital (West Virginia University Hospitals), aimed at enhancing quality
97 improvement efforts. This dataset encompasses appointments across all clinic departments on main
98 campus and satellite, outreach locations and visit types, including information on healthcare
99 providers and weather/environmental conditions. To facilitate analysis, categorical data were
100 transformed into multiple binary variables. For instance, the original "day of the week of the
101 appointment" feature, ranging from 1 to 7 (representing Sunday to Saturday), was converted into
102 seven binary indicators, each indicating the appointment's occurrence on a specific day. Numerical
103 features were normalized to a range of 0 to 1. The labels indicating appointment outcomes were
104 binary, with 1 indicating a no-show and 0 denoting attendance. Notably, a single patient may have
105 multiple records due to multiple appointments. The patient demographic largely comprises children,
106 often accompanied by their parents or caregivers to appointments.

107

108 *Machine Learning Algorithm Development*

109 Our current model leverages pediatric appointments from 2015-2018 (training/testing), 2019
110 (validation), and 2020 (external holdout) that were scheduled at West Virginia University Outpatient
111 Clinics under the West Virginia University Hospital Systems in Morgantown, West Virginia. The
112 datasets consist of 209,408 (2015-2018), 82,925 (2019), and 58,820 (2020) patient appointments. A
113 total of 46 features were collected that included demographic factors, time of appointment, hospital
114 variables, type of appointment scheduled, and environmental conditions.

115 Our machine learning model relies on a XGBoost framework that allows for adaptable weighting of
116 variables and hyperparameter optimization [30]. To predict patient no-shows, we implemented the
117 XGBoost algorithm using the XGBClassifier, chosen for its robust performance on complex datasets.
118 The classifier was configured with a gradient boosting 'gbtree' booster and a base score of 0.5. We set
119 the learning rate to 0.3 and the maximum depth of trees to 6, ensuring the model was sufficiently
120 detailed yet avoided overfitting. Each tree node considered all features due to a subsample rate and
121 colsample parameters set to 1. The model utilized 100 estimators, with the optimization objective set
122 to binary logistic, tailored for binary classification tasks.

123 For regularization, which helps reduce model complexity and enhance performance, we used
124 a lambda value of 1 and an alpha value of 0. Handling missing values automatically, the model
125 treated missing data points as NaNs, allowing for flexibility in dealing with incomplete records. The
126 model operated under a binary logistic objective, focusing on the probability of no-show events. A
127 total of four parallel jobs were run (*n_jobs* set to 4), exploiting multi-core processing to expedite
128 computation. The random state was anchored at 0 to ensure consistency and reproducibility across
129 model runs. We employed an automatic predictor setting, which optimally selected the most efficient
130 prediction method based on the data structure. The tuning of hyperparameters like *max_depth*,
131 *min_child_weight*, *subsample*, and *colsample_bytree* was conducted through a methodical grid
132 search to identify the optimal balance, enhancing model effectiveness without overfitting. This
133 methodological approach was geared towards developing a robust predictive model that could
134 effectively forecast patient no-show probabilities in pediatric outpatient settings, considering various
135 patient and environmental factors.

136

137 *Performance Evaluation Metrics*

138 The model's performance was evaluated using standard metrics: accuracy, precision, recall, and area
139 under the ROC curve (AUROC). The ROC curve plots the true positive rate (sensitivity) against the

140 false positive rate (1-specificity) at different thresholds ranging from 0 to 1. The prediction scores
141 (i.e., the predicted probabilities of no-shows) are compared at each threshold. A higher AUROC
142 value (closer to 1) indicates better prediction quality. Similarly, the precision-recall curve (PRC) and
143 area under the PRC (AUPRC) were calculated. Precision measures the accuracy of positive
144 predictions, while recall measures the model's ability to identify all actual positives. These metrics
145 collectively provide insights into the model's predictive accuracy and effectiveness.

146

147 *SHAP Feature Analysis*

148 We employed SHAP (SHapley Additive exPlanations) feature analysis to interpret the predictive
149 model's behavior and understand the importance of each feature in making predictions. SHAP values
150 provide insights into how individual features contribute to the model's output. By decomposing the
151 model's output for each prediction, SHAP enables us to understand the impact of each feature on the
152 prediction outcome. Particularly, SHAP summary plots was generated to visualize the overall feature
153 importance and understand the relationship between specific features and the predicted outcome.
154 Positive SHAP values indicate a feature that contributes to increasing the prediction, while negative
155 values suggest a feature that decreases the prediction.

156

157 *Intellectual Property/Data Availability*

158 Our machine learning algorithm is covered by a provisional patent filed between Aspirations LLC
159 and West Virginia University. This is distinctly unique from other filed patents, including
160 US0150242819A1 [2015] – utilizing advanced statistical techniques with no indication of accuracy
161 or performance of the models. US20110208674A1 [2010] – a similar concept but within a ticket
162 booking system. WO2018058189A1 [2016] – describes a supervised learning module that targets
163 overbooking strategies, rather than uniquely identifying patients who are at risk of no-showing their

164 appointment. Due to confidentiality agreements and the proprietary nature of the technology, the
165 underlying data supporting this work is not publicly available.

166

167 *Statistics*

168 Baseline characteristics of the dataset were analyzed to provide insights into the demographic, clinic-
169 based, insurance and appointment-related attributes of the patient population. Descriptive statistics,
170 including measures of central tendency and dispersion, were computed for numerical variables such
171 as age and appointment duration etc. Categorical variables, such as gender and appointment type,
172 were summarized using frequency distributions.

173 To identify factors influencing the likelihood of patient no-shows, univariate and multivariate
174 analyses were conducted. Univariate analyses involved assessing the association between each
175 individual predictor variable and the outcome variable (completed vs. show) using appropriate
176 statistical tests such as chi-square tests for categorical variables and t-tests or ANOVA for continuous
177 variables.

178

179 **Results**

180 **Baseline Characteristics and Influence of Variables on No-show Rates.**

181 We retrospectively collected records from 161,822 hospital appointments made by 19,450 patients
182 between January 1st, 2015 and December 31st, 2019 at pediatric clinics of all specialties in West
183 Virginia University Hospitals [WVUH]. From our experience the main factors driving the no-show
184 rate were the days until the scheduled appointments. The longer the interval, the less likelihood of the
185 appointment being completed. We also noted that same day appointments had low likelihood of
186 patient no-shows. If the appointment was canceled or rescheduled that was another important
187 predictive factor resulting in the no-shows. Interestingly full-time employment status of the parent
188 had a positive impact on the adherence to the appointment in our pediatric clinics. Thos with

189 previous history of no-shows tend to have more chances of missing future appointments. Though it
190 was not a major factor? but we noted that some pediatric specialties had higher chances of
191 completing appointments for example Cardiology, Nephrology while others had higher chances of
192 experiencing patient no-shows for example Hematology, Neurology, Gastroenterology.

193 Gender, weather, race or ethnicity, language preference were not significantly impacting the status of
194 a no-show for a scheduled appointment.

195

196 **Performance of model predictions of no-shows**

197 The machine learning model developed the no-show prediction probabilities. Table 2
198 highlights the superior prediction capacity of patient no-shows when using all 46 features collected
199 (Precision: 0.82, Recall: 0.88) as well as the top 5 predictive features (Precision: 0.81, Recall: 0.84)
200 in the validation dataset. This is further captured by the Receiver Operator Characteristic (ROC) Area
201 Under the Curve (AUC) for all features (AUC: 0.90) and top 5 features (AUC: 0.88) (Figure 1).
202 Additionally, we used the basic “no-show rate” alone to compute the likelihood of a patient being
203 compliant with their visit (AUC: 0.64) (Figure 1). This “no-show rate” is a simple frequency: (total
204 visits the patient has no-showed) / (total visits the patient has attended + total visits the patient has
205 no-showed). This frequency is commonly employed by EMR systems to provide a baseline
206 estimation if double booking or other alternative scheduling procedures should be enacted. To test if
207 our algorithm can provide unbiased predictions across racial/ethnic groups, we subset the data. While
208 Caucasians make up the primary patient population, our algorithm can efficiently generalize to other
209 racial and ethnic populations, even when underrepresented (Table 3). From our analyses in the
210 pediatric population, the no-show rate alone was insufficient to effectively predict patient compliance
211 with their appointment. Additionally, features that were most important to the construction of the
212 model were not within a single category, highlighting the complexity in interpreting of patient no-

213 shows (Figure 2). The top five most predictive features extended across demographic factors, time of
214 the appointment, hospital variables, and type of appointment.

215

216 **Evaluation of Model Generalizability and Adaptability to unknown Healthcare Needs**

217 We also wanted to understand if our model was adaptable to the changing dynamics of
218 healthcare needs and initiatives, such as those driven by the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19),
219 which created an increase of no-contact telehealth appointments. The evaluation of our holdout
220 dataset (2020), which contained 35% telehealth visits, revealed that our model provided superior
221 predictions across all features (AUC: 0.90) and the topmost predictive features (AUC: 0.88) (Figure
222 3). Again, we showed that the traditional “no-show rate” computed in the EMR system was
223 significantly inferior to our integrative approach (AUC: 0.62). We further evaluated the top 5 features
224 in the model, which revealed the same features as seen in the validation dataset (i.e., Demographics-
225 8, Time-3, Hospital-5, Appointment-11, and Appointment-10) (Data Not Shown). Model robustness
226 on the 2020 pediatric telemedicine dataset and the shared top features between the validation and
227 external holdout dataset highlight the persistence of our machine learning model to generate accurate
228 predictions of patient no-shows. Additionally, the preliminary data is from pediatric appointments,
229 highlighting our algorithm’s ability to predict the no-show rate of the patient based primarily on
230 external factors, such as transportation by the guardian/caregiver.

231

232 For our system at WVU, we learned that strategic double booking might be a solution. Most of our
233 clinics had 20 minutes visit slots, so for a 4 hours clinic session, our proposed double booking was
234 focused towards the middle of the session with a limit of 2 per 4 hours and 3 for 8 hours. Some of our
235 specialists had 30 minutes for a return visit and 1 hour for a new patient visit. For those schedules our
236 strategy was to overbook a follow up visit in the new patient visit slot with a new patient who had
237 waited over 3 months for the appointment as the data suggested decreased probability of patient

238 adherence to a scheduled appointment after 3 months wait time. We strongly recommended not
239 overbooking at the beginning or end of a clinic session to maintain the flow of the clinic as well as
240 considering the providers efficiency during the clinic session. As the technology improves all these
241 measures might even become second nature in clinic patient scheduling.

242 **Discussion**

243 Our technology uses an AI-based machine-learning algorithm to predict the probability of
244 individual patients not showing to an appointment on a given date and time. The algorithm uses a
245 patient's historical demographic data to proactively predict no-shows and employ strategic double
246 booking to avoid disruptions and minimize costs to the clinic. Unlike other scheduling systems that
247 employ advanced statistical techniques (such as logistic regression and Bayesian prediction), our
248 platform leverages cutting-edge machine learning technology -- a scalable, distributed gradient-
249 boosted decision tree algorithm utilizing minimal feature input for easy implementation across all
250 healthcare systems -- that continues to learn and improve, thus increasing prediction accuracy over
251 time.

252 Of the work that has been done to improve patient no-show prediction, many studies have
253 failed to perform superiorly to the basic statistic of no-show rate displayed per patient [17]. Of the
254 studies that performed better than the no-show rate basic statistic, most algorithms have not shown
255 superior performance in predicting patient no-shows (i.e., AUC <0.85) and have also only been
256 applied to very specific populations (i.e., a single population or visit type) [17]. While the current
257 algorithms predicting patient no-shows reveal promise for clinical application [27, 28], there is
258 currently no validated machine learning algorithm incorporated into an EMR to provide real-time
259 predictions. Additionally, due to the limited scope of most no-show prediction algorithms, racial bias
260 within the algorithm can result in up to a 30% increase in wait time for black patients [29];

261 optimizing care for patients, regardless of gender, race/ethnicity, and socioeconomic status, requires a
262 demonstration of the algorithms stability across these conditions to promote healthcare equity.

263

264 Clinics currently utilize scheduling protocols that dictate how patients get scheduled for each
265 clinic and within different specialties. There's considerable variability per provider, per clinic, and
266 sometimes even per site within a healthcare system. Epic Systems Corporation (Epic) Electronic
267 Medical Record (EMR) has a basic statistic that displays the no-show rate per patient in the
268 scheduling software, but there is little knowledge about the prospective performance of this
269 information. However, this information is not currently utilized in improving the scheduling of
270 appointments.

271 While the scheduling staff can see the historic no-show rate for each patient when they call
272 for an appointment, they have no autonomy to actively modify scheduling to reduce patient no-shows
273 and follow the guidance of clinic protocols. As such, commonly implemented approaches to avoid
274 no-shows include appointment reminders and no-show fines, while approaches to reduce the impact
275 of no-shows on the providers and the healthcare system include double booking. Double booking
276 could offer an advantage to both the patient and provider if implemented in a strategic manner,
277 including through combination with predictive AI algorithms. However, such automated "strategic
278 double booking" would require a machine-learning algorithm capable of dynamically updating based
279 on each patient's likelihood of missing an appointment. For example, at WVU, strategic double
280 booking was observed to be an effective approach. In clinics with 20-minute visit slots, double
281 booking was typically concentrated in the middle of 4-hour sessions, with a common limit of two
282 patients for a 4-hour session and three for an 8-hour session. For specialists with 30-minute return
283 visits and 1-hour new patient appointments, follow-up visit slots were often overbooked with new
284 patients who had been waiting over 3 months, as data suggested a decrease in adherence following
285 such delays. Additionally, overbooking at the start or end of clinic sessions was generally avoided to

286 maintain clinic flow and optimize provider efficiency. As the technology improves all these measures
287 might even become second nature in clinic patient scheduling. Thus, there is an unmet need for
288 generalizable machine-learning approaches to both predict and proactively address patient no-shows
289 and their impact on the healthcare system.

290 **Limitations**

291 Our study looked at the clinic population in the Appalachian region of west Virginia. Even though
292 there was financial diversity within the state was taken into consideration, there might be factors that
293 were not obvious in our results due to limited ethnic and racial diversity in the state of West Virginia.
294 While our study provides valuable insights, it is important to acknowledge limitations such as
295 potential data biases and the retrospective nature of the analysis. Importantly, the data used in this
296 study are provided by a specific hospital or hospital system, and in pediatric population thus the
297 generalizability of the research results may be limited. Future research can extend the data source to
298 other hospitals and to other population and age ranges to cross-validate our results or could focus on
299 prospectively collecting data and implementing interventions to evaluate their effectiveness in
300 reducing patient no-show rates.

301 Our proposed solution of strategic overbooking, itself, has its limitation. It depends on the protocols
302 shared with the call center to offer certain slots for overbooking. We believe that a model actively
303 analyzing the patient no-show data and proposing slots in real time using the patient no-show history
304 might be a better solution to take away any end user bias or human errors in interpreting the protocol
305 implementation.

306

307 **Conclusions**

308 No-shows in healthcare settings pose significant challenges for both providers and patients.
309 Understanding the underlying factors driving these no-shows is crucial for developing effective

310 interventions to reduce their occurrence and enhance clinic efficiency. This study proposes the
311 implementation of a machine learning framework to predict patient no-shows, offering hospitals a
312 proactive approach to optimize their outpatient appointment systems. By accurately anticipating
313 potential no-show behavior, healthcare facilities can implement targeted strategies such as
314 personalized appointment reminders, flexible scheduling options, and provider-specific interventions
315 to mitigate the impact of no-shows on healthcare delivery. These proactive measures not only
316 improve clinic efficiency but also enhance patient satisfaction, provider productivity and overall
317 healthcare outcomes.

318 **Conflict of Interest**

319 The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial
320 relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

321 **Author Contributions**

322 JN, TC and NY contributed to conception and design of the study. NY organized the database. QH
323 and NY performed the statistical analysis and developed models. QH wrote the first draft of the
324 manuscript. JN, TC, and NY wrote sections of the manuscript. All authors contributed to manuscript
325 revision, read, and approved the submitted version.

326 **Funding**

327 N/A

328 **Data Availability**

329 All data produced in the present study are available upon reasonable request to the authors.

330

331 **Acknowledgments**

332 The authors express their gratitude to all the patients, providers, administrators, clinic staff,
333 schedulers and researchers at West Virginia University Hospitals who contributed and/or supported
334 our research.

335

336

337 **References**

- 338 Ahmadi, E., Garcia-Arce, A., Masel, D.T., Reich, E., Puckey, J., and Maff, R. (2019). A
339 metaheuristic-based stacking model for predicting the risk of patient no-show and late
340 cancellation for neurology appointments. *IISE Transactions on Healthcare Systems*
341 *Engineering* 9, 272-291.
- 342 Alshammari, A., Almalki, R., and Alshammari, R. (2021). Developing a Predictive Model of
343 Predicting Appointment No-Show by Using Machine Learning Algorithms. *Journal of*
344 *Advances in Information Technology* 12, 234-239.
- 345 Alshammari, R., Daghistani, T., and Alshammari, A. (2020). The Prediction of Outpatient No-Show
346 Visits by using Deep Neural Network from Large Data. (*IJACSA*) *International Journal of*
347 *Advanced Computer Science and Applications* 11, 533-539.
- 348 Ansell, D., Crispo, J.a.G., Simard, B., and Bjerre, L.M. (2017). Interventions to reduce wait times for
349 primary care appointments: a systematic review. *BMC Health Serv Res* 17, 295.
- 350 Chen, J., Goldstein, I.H., Lin, W.C., Chiang, M.F., and Hribar, M.R. (2020). Application of Machine
351 Learning to Predict Patient No-Shows in an Academic Pediatric Ophthalmology Clinic. *AMIA*
352 *Annu Symp Proc* 2020, 293-302.
- 353 Chong, L.R., Tsai, K.T., Lee, L.L., Foo, S.G., and Chang, P.C. (2020). Artificial Intelligence
354 Predictive Analytics in the Management of Outpatient MRI Appointment No-Shows. *AJR Am*
355 *J Roentgenol* 215, 1155-1162.
- 356 Daghistani, T., Alghamdi, H., Alshammari, R., and Alhazme, R.H. (2020). Predictors of outpatients'
357 no-show: big data analytics using apache spark. *Journal of Big Data* 7.
- 358 Ellis, D.A., Mcqueenie, R., Mcconnachie, A., Wilson, P., and Williamson, A.E. (2017).
359 Demographic and practice factors predicting repeated non-attendance in primary care: a
360 national retrospective cohort analysis. *Lancet Public Health* 2, e551-e559.
- 361 Fan, G., Deng, Z., Ye, Q., and Wang, B. (2021). Machine learning-based prediction models for
362 patients no-show in online outpatient appointments. *Data Science and Management* 2, 45-52.
- 363 Festinger, D.S., Lamb, R.J., Marlowe, D.B., and Kirby, K.C. (2002). From telephone to office: intake
364 attendance as a function of appointment delay. *Addict Behav* 27, 131-137.
- 365 Gier, J. (2017). *Missed appointments cost the U.S. healthcare system \$150B each year* [Online].
366 Online: Healthcare Innovation. Available: [https://www.hcinnovationgroup.com/clinical-](https://www.hcinnovationgroup.com/clinical-it/article/13008175/missed-appointments-cost-the-us-healthcare-system-150b-each-year)
367 [it/article/13008175/missed-appointments-cost-the-us-healthcare-system-150b-each-year](https://www.hcinnovationgroup.com/clinical-it/article/13008175/missed-appointments-cost-the-us-healthcare-system-150b-each-year)
368 [Accessed 2023].
- 369 Hayhurst, C. (2019). *No-show effect: Even one missed appointment risks retention* [Online]. Online:
370 Athenahealth. Available: [https://www.athenahealth.com/knowledge-hub/financial-](https://www.athenahealth.com/knowledge-hub/financial-performance/no-show-effect-even-one-missed-appointment-risks-retention)
371 [performance/no-show-effect-even-one-missed-appointment-risks-retention](https://www.athenahealth.com/knowledge-hub/financial-performance/no-show-effect-even-one-missed-appointment-risks-retention) [Accessed 2023].
- 372 Liu, D., Shin, W.Y., Sprecher, E., Conroy, K., Santiago, O., Wachtel, G., and Santillana, M. (2022).
373 Machine learning approaches to predicting no-shows in pediatric medical appointment. *NPJ*
374 *Digit Med* 5, 50.
- 375 Marbough, D., Khaleel, I., Al Shanqiti, K., Al Tamimi, M., Simsekler, M.C.E., Ellahham, S.,
376 Alibazoglu, D., and Alibazoglu, H. (2020). Evaluating the Impact of Patient No-Shows on
377 Service Quality. *Risk Manag Healthc Policy* 13, 509-517.

- 378 Mohammadi, I., Wu, H., Turkcan, A., Toscos, T., and Doebbeling, B.N. (2018). Data Analytics and
379 Modeling for Appointment No-show in Community Health Centers. *J Prim Care Community*
380 *Health* 9, 2150132718811692.
- 381 Moharram, A., Altamimi, S., and Alshammari, R. (2021). "Data Analytics and Predictive Modeling
382 for Appointments No-show at a Tertiary Care Hospital", in: *2021 1st International*
383 *Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Data Analytics (CAIDA)*. (Riyadh, Saudi Arabia).
- 384 Qureshi, Z., Maqbool, A., Mirza, A., Iqbal, M.Z., Afzal, F., Kanubala, D.D., Rana, T., Umair, M.Y.,
385 Wakeel, A., and Shah, S.K. (2021). Efficient Prediction of Missed Clinical Appointment
386 Using Machine Learning. *Comput Math Methods Med* 2021, 2376391.
- 387 Salazar, L.H.A., Leithardt, V.R.Q., Parreira, W.D., Fernandes, A.M.R., Barbosa, J.L.V., and Correia,
388 S.D. (2021). Application of Machine Learning Techniques to Predict a Patient's No-Show in
389 the Healthcare Sector. *Future Internet* 14, 3.
- 390 Salazar, L.H.A., Parreira, W.D., Fernandes, A.M.R., and Leithardt, V.R.Q. (2022). No-Show in
391 Medical Appointments with Machine Learning Techniques: A Systematic Literature Review.
392 *Information* 13, 507.
- 393 Shameer, K., Johnson, K.W., Yahi, A., Miotto, R., Li, L.I., Ricks, D., Jebakaran, J., Kovatch, P.,
394 Sengupta, P.P., Gelijns, S., Moskovitz, A., Darrow, B., David, D.L., Kasarskis, A., Tatonetti,
395 N.P., Pinney, S., and Dudley, J.T. (2017). Predictive Modeling of Hospital Readmission Rates
396 Using Electronic Medical Record-Wide Machine Learning: A Case-Study Using Mount Sinai
397 Heart Failure Cohort. *Pac Symp Biocomput* 22, 276-287.
- 398 Srinivas, S., and Salah, H. (2021). Consultation length and no-show prediction for improving
399 appointment scheduling efficiency at a cardiology clinic: A data analytics approach.
400 *International Journal of Medical Informatics* 145.

401
402

403 **Tables**

404

405 **Table 1:** Details of the Study Population and influence of the variables across the show and no-show

406 appointments.

Parameter	Completed Appointment [95% CI] (n=116,442)	Not Completed Appointment [95% CI] (n=93,202)	P-Value	Cohen (Effect Size)
Patient's Age (years)	11.56 [11.49-11.62]	11.27 [11.2-11.33]	<0.001	0.0267
Gender (% Male)	61478 (52.80%)	48409 (51.94%)	<0.001	0.0172
Race Ethnicity (% Caucasian)	108668 (93.32%)	86103 (92.38%)	<0.001	0.0377
English Fluency (% Fluent)	114644 (98.46%)	91307 (97.97%)	<0.001	0.0397
Department				
Allergy/Immunology	12811 (11.00%)	9643 (10.35%)	<0.001	0.021
Cardiology	18532 (15.92%)	10872 (11.66%)	<0.001	0.1162*
Craniofacial Surgery	694 (0.60%)	564 (0.61%)	0.7879	0.0012
Cardiothoracic Surgery	1881 (1.62%)	1239 (1.33%)	<0.001	0.0227
Dermatology	1550 (1.33%)	1187 (1.27%)	0.2486	0.005
Endocrinology	12739 (10.94%)	9290 (9.97%)	<0.001	0.0312
Gastroenterology	10864 (9.33%)	11661 (12.51%)	<0.001	0.1094*
Hematology/Oncology	7350 (6.31%)	3342 (3.59%)	<0.001	0.1121*
Infectious Diseases	1125 (0.97%)	920 (0.99%)	0.6276	0.0021
Neurology	11847 (10.17%)	13610 (14.60%)	<0.001	0.1465*
Neonatology	1329 (1.14%)	1366 (1.47%)	<0.001	0.0305
Neurosurgery	4119 (3.54%)	3665 (3.93%)	<0.001	0.0214
Nephrology	6152 (5.28%)	6946 (7.45%)	<0.001	0.097
Orthopedics	13942 (11.97%)	8209 (8.81%)	<0.001	0.0975
Plastic Surgery	304 (0.26%)	225 (0.24%)	0.3725	0.0039
Pulmonology	1812 (1.56%)	2425 (2.60%)	<0.001	0.0845
Sports Medicine	298 (0.26%)	153 (0.16%)	<0.001	0.0182
Surgery (General)	3071 (2.64%)	1823 (1.96%)	<0.001	0.0425
Urology	17474 (15.01%)	19321 (20.73%)	<0.001	0.1603*
Other Departments	395 (0.34%)	351 (0.38%)	0.1533	0.0064
Days Until Scheduled Appointment	48.06 [47.68-48.44]	82.28 [81.74-82.82]	<0.001	0.5180*
Appointment Length	25.05 [24.98-25.11]	26.45 [26.38-26.52]	<0.001	0.1251*
Referral Required	16837 (14.46%)	14858 (15.94%)	<0.001	0.0421
Overbooked Timeslot	12302 (10.56%)	5602 (6.01%)	<0.001	0.1482*
Same Day Appointment	9926 (8.52%)	829 (0.89%)	<0.001	0.2734*
Canceled Appointment Ratio	20.40% [20.29%-20.51%]	29.07% [28.93%-29.22%]	<0.001	0.4544*
No-Show Appointment Ratio	3.65% [3.62%-3.69%]	5.12% [5.07%-5.17%]	<0.001	0.2249*
Guardian Gender (% Male)	14325 (22.98%)	7380 (19.86%)	<0.001	0.0742
Employment Status				
Full-Time	58784 (50.48%)	31562 (33.86%)	<0.001	0.3324*
Part-Time	7903 (6.79%)	4758 (5.11%)	<0.001	0.0669
Student	1814 (1.56%)	977 (1.05%)	<0.001	0.0412
Unemployed	32678 (28.06%)	23121 (24.81%)	<0.001	0.0725
Insurance (% Medicaid)	50497 (43.37%)	35233 (37.80%)	<0.001	0.1123*
Copay Due at Visit	8.07 [7.98-8.16]	6.29 [6.2-6.38]	<0.001	0.1146*
Maximum Temperature	65.23 [65.12-65.33]	63.94 [63.82-64.06]	<0.001	0.0699
Minimum Temperature	47.41 [47.31-47.51]	46.35 [46.24-46.47]	<0.001	0.0615
Temperature	56.19 [56.09-56.29]	55.03 [54.92-55.15]	<0.001	0.0673

Wind Chill	27.32 [27.21-27.43]	25.96 [25.83-26.09]	<0.001	0.1008*
Precipitation	0.13 [0.13-0.13]	0.13 [0.13-0.13]	0.0235	0.01
Wind Speed	10.38 [10.36-10.4]	10.42 [10.4-10.44]	0.0057	0.0121
Cloud Cover	52.53 [52.35-52.72]	53.79 [53.59-54]	<0.001	0.0395
Relative Humidity	67.26 [67.19-67.34]	67.45 [67.37-67.53]	0.0011	0.0142
Weather - Clear	29065 (24.96%)	22124 (23.74%)	<0.001	0.0283
Weather - Rain	56191 (48.26%)	45990 (49.34%)	<0.001	0.0218
Weather - Overcast	35816 (30.76%)	30136 (32.33%)	<0.001	0.0341
Weather - Partially cloudy	51561 (44.28%)	40942 (43.93%)	0.1066	0.0071

407

408 **Table 2.** Model performance metrics on the 2019 validation data.

	Precision	Recall	F1-score
All Features			
Negative Class	0.83	0.75	0.79
Positive Class	0.82	0.88	0.85
Accuracy			0.82
Top 5 Features			
Negative Class	0.78	0.74	0.76
Positive Class	0.81	0.84	0.82
Accuracy			0.80

409


410 **Table 3.** Model training on the entire dataset followed by application and evaluation on individual
 411 racial and ethnic groups.

Racial/Ethnic Group	2015-2018 (# of Patients and Total Percent)	2019 (# of Patients and ROC AUC)	2020 (# of Patients and ROC AUC)
Caucasian	177, 375 (93%)	67,559 (AUC: 0.89)	47,495 (AUC: 0.89)
Black	5,644 (3.0%)	1,999 (AUC: 0.84)	1,466 (AUC: 0.83)
Two or More Races	4,570 (2.4%)	1,933 (AUC: 0.75)	1,408 (AUC: 0.83)
Hispanic/Latino	2,386 (1.2%)	1,095 (AUC: 0.79)	731 (AUC: 0.81)
Asian American	1,073 (0.6%)	568 (AUC: 0.83)	372 (AUC: 0.85)
Native American	204 (0.1%)	69 (AUC: 0.84)	84 (AUC: 0.78)

412

413 **Figure Legends**


414 **Figure 1. Performance of the machine learning (XGBoost) model for predicting no-shows in the**
415 **hold-out test set.** AUROC of xgboost machine learning model all features (blue line), only the top-5
416 features (orange line) and the direct no-show/cancel rate (yellow line) in predicting no-shows for
417 2019 hold-out validation dataset.



418

419

420 **Figure 2. Feature importance in predicting no-shows.** SHAP summary plot for the top 10 features
421 contributing to the XGBoost model. Each line represents a feature, and the abscissa is the SHAP
422 value. Red dots represent higher feature values, blue dots represent lower feature values and grey
423 dots represent missing values.




424

425

426

427 **Figure 3. Performance of the machine learning (XGBoost) model for predicting no-shows in the**
428 **external validation dataset.** AUROC of xgboost machine learning model all features (blue line),
429 only the top-5 features (orange line) and the direct no-show/cancel rate (yellow line) in predicting no-
430 shows of the 2020 telemedicine dataset during the pandemic season.



431

432